DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 062 HE 022 228

AUTHOR Read, Ira
TITLE The Second Wave: The Small Protestant College in the South after the Civil War.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 21p.
PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Church Related Colleges; College Administration; *Educational History; Higher Education; *Private Colleges; *Protestants; Rural Areas; Small Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *United States (South)

ABSTRACT

The creation, growth and history of white, coeducational, four-year, small, Protestant, liberal arts colleges in the South during the period between the Civil War and World War II are reviewed. The primary issues discussed are the geographical location of such colleges, their religious atmospheres, the problems of the college constituency, the problems of college governance, and raising and spending money. It is concluded that: (1) the desirability of a rural location, as a safeguard against the sins of the world, restricted the development of the college in many cases; (2) the degree of religiosity was not extreme; (3) the actual control by religious denominations was limited by local constraints and lack of adequate support for the college by the denomination; (4) college presidents became increasingly more powerful as local control by trustees dwindled; and (5) the colleges failed to deal with their financial problems in any coherent and consistent manner. Contains 47 reference notes. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED304062

The Second Wave

The Small Protestant College in the South after the Civil War

Ira Read
Department of History
Appalachian State University
Boone, NC 28608

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

IRA READ

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 022 228

Small, Protestant colleges in America, the colleges attended by Ronald Reagan (Eureka), Richard Nixon (Whittier), and Dan Quayle (DePauw), are a well known but infrequently studied part of American life. The attention of educational historians has been focused on the Ivy League and the great state universities and when they have deigned to look at the small colleges they have tended to see schools like Amherst, Williams, or even Oberlin.[1] Oberlin, indeed, has become a kind of an historians paradigm for almost every private, church related college west of the Appalachians, because while it no longer maintains a religious affiliation, it has been the subject of careful historical studies.[2] There are still at least some four hundred small, Protestant colleges dotted throughout America and few of them bear any real resemblance to a school like Oberlin. Reagan's alma mater is a better example of what church colleges are really like. Although Oberlin[3] and, for example, Eureka are both small, Protestant colleges they are exceedingly difficult to compare. In financial resources alone, the differences are great. In 1980, Eureka had 461 students and an income of $72,000 from endowment while Oberlin had 2600 students and an income of $6,000,000 from endowment.[4] Oberlin has a long and distinguished existence, while Eureka's story is the more common one of continued struggle for survival.

The small, struggling Christian college has long been identified, correctly or not, with the South, and the typical Southern college is much more like Eureka than Oberlin. About half of contemporary Protestant, four-year colleges are located in the South, if Texas and Missouri are included in

the count. They range in size from universities like Southern Methodist University and Emory with huge endowments to colleges with barely three hundred students and endowments of less than $1,000,000. Their range in age is as great. The oldest of these Southern colleges, William and Mary, was loosely connected to the Episcopalian church prior to the revolution. Hampden-Sydney, Transylvania, Tusculum University, and the College of Charleston were also established prior to 1800. From 1800 to 1859 at least another forty seven colleges were established. Many of these schools, like the University of the South, were chartered before the Civil War but actually came into being after the war. Other colleges like Catawba had an effective existence only after 1865. Moreover, many of these colleges were primarily academies before the war. Tusculum University, which claims to be the oldest college west of the Appalachia, was originally just an academy. Only after the Civil War did it become strictly a college.[5] Probably the majority of Southern colleges kept academies until the 1920's. Between 1865 and 1900 another seventy colleges were created, about half of them for blacks, and another eighteen were established prior to World War I. Since 1918 at least another twenty one colleges have been established[6] and this does not count any of the Bible colleges, some of which are moving slowly toward a comprehensive or liberal arts status. This counts only the surviving colleges. An untold number of colleges fell by the wayside or were consolidated with surviving colleges.[7]

Although histories of individual Southern colleges have been written since the turn of the century,[8] they have been a neglected source of knowledge about higher education in the South. Many of the early histories verge on hagiography, although this in itself tells us something about Southern colleges. Others were written primarily as public relations tools and

while some of these may be fun to read, they provide very little insight into the history of Southern education. Useful histories do exist, however, and in recent years, the quality of historical research has improved considerably. This preliminary study is based primarily on some of the better histories available. There are still some fine histories to be perused and in the next few years a considerable number of promising histories appear to be in the offing.

This phase of the study leaves out Bible colleges, black colleges, women's colleges, and Catholic colleges in the South. Each of these kinds of colleges merit a study of their own. The emphasis here is on the white, coeducational, four-year, small, Protestant, liberal arts college in the South during the period of creation and growth between the Civil War and World War II. The primary issues to be dealt with are the geographical location of colleges, the religious atmosphere of such colleges, the problems of the college constituency, the problems of governing a college, and above all the getting and spending of money which affects everything else.

The location of colleges in the South sometimes appears to have been a matter of chance. Quite often, however, the choice of a rural site was quite intentional. The colleges that are judged most successful in our time, like Vanderbilt and Duke, were founded in potential cities or were fortunate enough to have the cities eventually grow out to include them. More commonly, however, an urban location was considered a liability by the church or by the founding fathers of the college. The Tusculum catalogue in 1847 stated that its " . . . distance from Greeneville and Rheatown is such as gives it all the advantages of a location in a town, and also guards it from all the ensnaring and demoralizing influence of a town on the minds and morals of youth . . . ."[9] A prospectus for West Virginia Wesleyan called it ". . . an ideal location, a beautiful country town, near the centre of the State, free

from saloons, well supplied with churches, and probably as free from evil influences as any town of the size in the State."[10] It could be argued that many schools had little choice in their location since it depended on what land they were given. This appears to be true but where they had the choice more often than not they opted for a small town or even rural location. Later on, even in the nineteenth century, there were some regrets about location. Maryville College contemplated three different moves; Carson-Newman considered a move to Knoxville; and Tusculum considered a move to Johnson City, Tennessee or a merger with King College in Bristol, Tennessee.[11] Catawba College in North Carolina decided it was situated in too small a town and changed its location from Newton to Salisbury in 1925.[12] Morris Harvey College (now the University of Charleston), after almost fifty years of a very precarious existence, finally moved from tiny Barboursville, West Virginia to Charleston and attained some continuity and stability.[13]

Daniel Boorstin in *The Americans* talks about the "Booster College," the practice of towns competing for colleges by offering cash and land. Wooster College, he notes, was founded in Wooster because the citizens gave a site worth $25,000 and another $100,000 in cash.[14] This practice appears less prevalent in the South, perhaps because there was less money available and/or because of a failure to see an economic value in having a local college. However, local citizens tried to induce first Baptists, then Methodists, and finally Presbyterians to establish a school in the town of Elkins, West Virginia. Even after Davis & Elkins was established, there were efforts from time to time to persuade the college to move.[15]

The role of railroads in the founding of Southern colleges is a subject that needs more study. A college appears about every thirty miles on the

Southern Railway running through Tennessee . In the 1920's and 1930's, and even into the 1950's the railroad became a pipeline for Yankee students going to cheaper and often less selective colleges. Colleges with poor or no railroad connections found themselves less able to compete for Yankee students when the student crunch came after WWI. There was a clear shift in the source of students after the Civil War. In 1880, Maryville College got 75% of its students from the county and 99% from the state and by the 1930's less than a third from Tennessee and less than half from Southern states.[16] This was extreme but fairly typical.

The fact that a college is church-related should not imply that any particular degree of religiosity exists on campus. There is a great difference in the nature of a religious heritage (the obvious differences between Episcopalians and Baptists come to mind) and even within the same religious heritage there are often enormous differences between colleges. There are visions of well scrubbed young men and women carrying Bibles and filing silently into chapel services several days each week, living lives of chastity and eschewing tobacco, alcohol, drugs and dancing. Students like this can be found, of course, and college administrations often prefered to encourage that image, but the diversity is much greater than that. As American society changed between the Civil War and 1945, so also the social life and discipline of colleges changed. It is true that in the 19th century rules were quite strict, but this was true at state colleges as well, and certainly in the 20th century there are more stringent regulations at many church colleges. Mandatory Chapel was still being held at Appalachian State University as late as 1940, while some of the church colleges had already either dropped it or reduced it to a weekly, non-religious meeting. Dancing also was normally prohibited in the nineteenth century (any kind of unchapéroned contact at all was

discouraged) but gradually over the years the majority of church colleges either sanctioned dancing or pretended not to notice that dances were being held off campus.[17]

It is all too often assumed that church-related colleges were controlled with an iron hand by their denomination. Indeed, this is part of the misunderstanding about the nature of the church college. Richard Hofstadter originally complained about the narrow sectarianism involved in the creation of colleges prior to the Civil War, which led in his view to an unnecessary proliferation of weak colleges.[18] More recently, David Potts has suggested that denominationalism was much more of a factor in church colleges after the Civil War because college towns were no longer able to be the primary supporters of the college. Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists all began to exercise more control over their schools after the Civil War. Indeed, according to Potts, "the institutional mainstream of American higher education for at least the second half of the nineteenth century was composed of colleges, like those of the Baptists, moving in the direction of denominationalism rather than secularism."[19] However, inter-denominational and intra-denominational quarrels are infrequently referred to in college histories and it often appears that denominations were more indifferent than anything else.[20] In most cases denominations were reluctant to take over the school, unwilling to support it with money, and thus maintained little real control because they gave little real support. It was only in the 20th century when it appeared the colleges might go under that denominational support became more common. Perhaps churches also finally understood that these small colleges were providing their churches with ministers. A statement by the Chairman of the Board at the laying of

the cornerstone for Wofford College in 1851 is indicative of the general attitude toward the denominational relationship:

> . . . Wofford College, I need hardly remind you, will be a denominational college . . . the leading principles (of Methodism) are abhorrent to sectarian bigotry, and breathe the true spirit of catholic liberty, of universal good will . . .we shall open the doors of this Institution to any of the youth of this country who may apply for admission, not only without demanding any tests of dogmatic opinion, but also without any attempt to alienate them from the religious views in which they may have been brought up.[21]

After all, even in the nineteenth century, there were very few schools willing to be labelled narrow or sectarian.

Colleges normally had ministers for Presidents, although in the 19th century this was also quite common at state universities. The President was almost always a member of the particular denomination related to the college and sometimes there were rules on the percentage of faculty and trustees required to be from that denomination. At Carson-Newman, 75% of the faculty were to be Baptists, but exceptions could be made in the Fine Arts presumably on the grounds that most musicians and artists were pagan.[22] Quotas of this sort are rarely noted in college histories probably because such quotas usually were unstated. At Davis & Elkins the trustees discovered that two faculty members had no church membership at all. There was a great furor, but nothing was really done about it.[23] Most schools required some form of church membership but little more than was common for the day. At a Methodist or Presbyterian or Baptist college it could be expected that a majority of students would come from that denomination, but colleges from small denominations such as Salem, a Seventh Day Baptist college in West

Virginia, never had a majority or even plurality of their students from that denomination.[24] The historian of Catawba College reflected at the end of his book: "So it is that Catawba College now draws the great majority of her students from non-Reformed homes. The same is true of her faculty."[25]

The issue of religion is also a part of the problem of the college constituency. Colleges had both local and religious ties. In the beginning colleges drew their students from their immediate locale, and because church support was never sufficient, a great deal of their money was obtained locally as well. Their trustees were drawn from the denomination but also the locality. Thus, the college was forced to please the local community which might or might not be of the same denomination. At first this meant very little. There were few professors, few buildings, and little need for extensive support. But as needs became greater it could become a matter of whether to play to the community or the denomination. The more fortunate schools secured their support from other than localities and denominations. Berea was able to secure money from the North enabling it to pursue policies often at odds with local sentiment. Of course, in the case of Berea, their original church constituency was not a denomination but an inter-denominational missionary agency.[26]

The church agencies were rarely generous with their funds but as time went on the churches became a primary source of students and often individuals within the churches contributed directly. However, as colleges developed alumni over the years, the alumni became major benefactors and as often as not there was no particular denominational allegiance involved for alumni. A Baptist student who went to a Presbyterian school usually remained Baptist; probably the choice of a denomination was more dependent on marriage rather than on choice of college. While colleges did

not get money from churches, at one point in time the colleges of the Disciples of Christ got 2.2% of their funding from the denomination;[27] the colleges did depend on churches for students. Even there a limit was quickly reached and colleges had to recruit elsewhere, After World War I local and denominational student constituencies dwindled when students started going more and more to state and regional universities (which were no longer just normal colleges). Southern schools began recruiting more extensively in the North, even resorting to practices such as head-hunting.

Location, religion, and the nature of the constituency were all factors in the governing of colleges. Would the college be run by the students, the faculty, the denomination, the trustees, or the President? Obviously students were never much of a factor in governance. The faculty at Tusculum took over control of the college from 1872 to 1879 but then handed governance back over to the trustees. Later the faculty fought with the President and got the power of scheduling and the creation of departments while giving the President power over buildings and grounds.[28] Faculties could threaten a mass resignation but there is no record of this ever succeeding. Mass resignations actually occured at Davis & Elkins but no changes in the nature of college governance were apparent.[29]

The major struggle for control of the college was between the President and the trustees. Initially, Presidents tended to run the schools; especially if they also happened to be the founders of the college. After the Civil War groups tended to found the colleges and to go out and hire the President. Administrative terms were short and not often presidencies would last but a year or two. Typically the President was a minister although sometimes the school might hire from within. There appears to be no particular correlation

between the degree of control by the church and the fact that most of the time a minister from that denomination served as President.

Where colleges had a number of local trustees, which was usual during the first few years in the life of a college (local trustees continued to dominate boards until the advent of cheap air transportation), the local trustees were heavily involved in the activities of the college. After all, the trustee might live across the street from the college. As late as 1920, the President of Carson-Newman complained, "I cannot buy a pencil unless it is first approved by a committee of the trustees."[30] There are a fair number of stories of trustee ignorance that surface in college histories, an example being the story of a member of the trustees finance committee objecting to the expenditure of $2000 for laboratory equipment because he was "agin spending so much money on commodes." [31]

As colleges broadened their base of support, the Presidency became more powerful. Trustees were further away and met but once or twice a year; and schisms developed within the board between local supporters and those associated with the church or the alumni. Despite inevitable harassment by the trustees the Presidents were often able to play "divide and conquer" and in at least one case to pack the board of trustees with new members.[32]

The accrediting associations were another factor in the increased power of the Presidency. The accrediting associations were more administration and faculty oriented and probably a certain amount of distaste existed between the academics involved with the association and the small town business men who dominated boards. Clearly this was an aid to the academic development of colleges but its reverse side was that presidents could do much as they liked with professors who were usually unprotected by tenure, imposed whatever kind of discipline they deemed suitable on students, and generally ignored

the wishes of at least individual trustees. Unless, of course, the President trod on the sacred grounds which were ordinarily located on the edge of the campus. Here the football coach presided, drawing a higher salary than any faculty member and often even higher than the President. After World War II, basketball more and more replaced football in the affections of alumni.

Most football programs were kept in bounds but almost every school apparently went through a period when the college existed for the sake of the athletic program. Local alumni and local trustees were hellbent on a strong athletic program and even the President was occasionally inclined to support some outlaw football programs. All too often a 2-7 record quickly translated into a 9-0 record with a new coach and a new group of not necessarily *bona fide* students playing. Davis & Elkins was turned down for accreditation partly because of conditions in athletics, a particular offense occuring when the trustees declared that the football coach could overrule the President on questions of student eligibility for athletics. Ultimately the trustees deplored professionalism, suggested a somewhat less pretentious schedule, and questioned whether it really mattered whether the school was accredited or not.[33] Emory and Henry lost its accreditation because of lax admission policies and scholarship problems related to athletics in the 1930's.[34] The real cure for football dynasties was the fact that other schools, after losing 49-0 too many times, dropped them the football factories from their schedule or even threw them out of the conference.

Finally, the getting and spending of money was the all encompassing determinant in the life of the small college. Almost without exception, college histories are bleak tales of financial hardship and sacrifice, of faculty not being paid for months at a time, of fires that threatened to close the college, of endowments that existed only on paper, of blackmail by wealthy

donors; in other words, an atmosphere where the survival of the college was doubtful from year. It is a story of a succession of yearly deficits followed by major fund drives that rarely succeeded and often were a matter of taking money from one pocket and putting it the other.

Small colleges, for the most part, never could or would charge enough tuition to cover the cost of instruction, much less the construction and maintenance of buildings. Hence a continued dependence on gift income that narrowed the deficit but all too often was insufficient to meet needs on a yearly basis. Inadequate income made it clearly impossible to handle a major financial crisis such as a dip in outside giving, a reduction in student enrollment, a major crisis like a fire, or the simple necessity of refurbishing an old building or building a new dormitory. Consequently colleges borrowed money and concerns about the endowment were postponed. It did not take long before debts were rising rapidly. Georgetown College as late as 1960 had a building debt of $1,000,000 and an endowment of $1,000,000.[35]

Raising money was often predicated on the hope of enlisting the aid of a millionaire. After the Civil War there were few millionaires left in the South but as the twentieth century approached more and more Yankee philanthropists were willing to give large sums of money. D. K. Pearsons of Chicago was one of the more generous and serious givers. He gave significant sums of money, totalling perhaps $5,000,000 in all, to some forty southern colleges. Pearsons usually offered funds on a matching basis but other than that there no strings attached.[36]

More often, unfortunately, there were requirements like those at West Virginia Wesleyan where the donor said funds for a building would be available only when construction actually commenced. In addition, the school must simultaneously construct two more buildings of equal or greater

worth. All of this occured at a time when money was quite scarce.[37] Very few Presidents had the nerve to suggest that it would also cost money to maintain these new buildings. Nettie McCormick, the widow of Silas McCormick, gave substantial sums to Tusculum over the years but always decided how the money should be used. She included stipulations that the President, a percentage of the faculty, and two thirds of the trustees must be Presbyterian. All of this came at a time when Tusculum was competing with King College some fifty miles away for a limited number of students and a limited amount of money. The President of the college could only complain.[38]

Life with philanthropists was no easy matter but it was further complicated by never knowing exactly what the school might receive on the death of the benefactor. Schools lived in the anticipation of large bequests that often never occurred. Mrs. McCormick left only $75,000 to Tusculum.[39] Sometimes the benefactor simply assumed the family would continue to support the college. Senator Elkins never provided for Davis & Elkins in his will, suggesting that the family would continue to provide funds, but the family gave only sporadic support thereafter.[40]

The other chief method of securing support was the creation of a campaign that would pay off the debts, build a building, and bring endowment up to a certain level. Financial campaigns usually began when operational caused creditors to start getting nervous. By this time maintenance was necessary; a new building was required; and of course endowment was a major consideration. The endowment had probably already been borrowed against to support operations. These financial campaigns were rarely successful; the all-time record for lack of success must belong to Mars Hill College which managed to raise only $99.50 out of a goal

of $20,000 on one of its drives.[41] Most drives were a bit more successful but it was by no means certain that even trustees would contribute.[42] College historians are often not able to give very precise results of such campaigns. This may result from administrative unwillingness to provide adequate information about unsuccessful drives, if indeed anyone really knows. Very few drives appear to have been entirely successful, however, and even those that did succeed often did so by drawing on funds that would normally have gone for other purposes.

The whole subject of endowments require further study. Stated endowments prior to 1945 were often based on dubious financial yardsticks. After all, endowments are the most common method of stating the financial status of a college. Endowment may reflect real assets that provide steady income or it may be an example of wishful thinking. For example, Union College was given a building in Louisville that was carried on the books at $250,000 but was eventually sold for a net of $48,000. In another case stock in Louisville Cement was listed at $200,000 but had an actual market value of $53,000.[43] Another dubious practice which confuses the picture was the use of endowment to grant mortgage loans. Almost two thirds of Maryville College's endowment in 1930 was in mortgage notes. The beginning of the end of this procedure came in the 1930's.[44] Another endowment problem, attributable to local trustees, was aptly expressed in a plaintive cry by the President of Tusculum: "It is not uncommon for us to have $50,000 to $75,000 in the bank drawing no interest at all. Furthermore, loans are made from our endowment funds to men in Greeneville who are business associates of our Greeneville trustees."[45]

Spending money was less of a problem than getting money, since there was very little to spend. With notable exceptions like Berea and of course

schools like Duke, Vanderbilt, and Emory, the problem was largely a matter of choosing how money would be spent. Clearly, money did not go to faculty salaries nor did it go into endowment. If money was lacking, buildings and grounds were neglected; faculty took salary cuts or simply had their paychecks postponed; and the college borrowed from endowment.[46] Considerable amounts of money went into paying the interest on debts and building new buildings. High administrative and staff overhead was not a problem before 1945 and probably not until the 1960's. Berea College was exceptional because it stayed out of debt for the most part [47] but most colleges had very little sense of fiscal planning Colleges were perhaps most religious in their seemingly unshakeable faith that God, the alumni, or a wealthy benefactor would provide. Too many years when the budget showed a deficit, it was simply assumed that more money would have to be raised for that year. If more money was not raised, then the salaries of the faculty could be cut or a faculty position eliminated.

This is a preliminary inquiry and as such requires a certain amount of skepticism. However, a few conclusions appear relatively safe. First, the desirability of a rural location as a safeguard against the sins of the world restricted in many cases the future development of the Protestant college. Second, while church colleges might appear religiously conservative to the secular world, the degree of religiosity was not, upon closer examination, all that extreme. Third, the actual control by denominations was limited by local constraints and the unwillingness or inability of denominations to provide the college with adequate support. Fourth, college presidents became increasingly more powerful as local control by trustees dwindled. Finally, and perhaps most important, colleges failed to deal with their financial problems in any coherent and consistent manner.

Small Protestant colleges have always faced adversity and the problems of recent years are neither particularly new or unique. The tendency to blame public education for the woes of the small college, whether it be the public community college movement or the expansion of the old normal schools into regional universities, is mostly a cop-out. The problems of small colleges are probably no more severe than they have ever been and many small church colleges have managed to prosper even when community colleges and regional universities were flourishing. While small colleges go under from time to time, most schools can look back into their history and find some era when their situation was even worse. The historian should never pretend to be a prophet but in all probability educators will still be analyzing the problems of small, Protestant colleges many years from now. And they will still be wondering whether the small Protestant college can or even should be saved.

---

1 The major works on higher education in America include Donald Tewksbury, *The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War . . .* (New York, 1932); Lawrence Cremin's three volume general study of, especially *American Education: The National Experience, 1783-1876* (New York, 1980); John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, *Higher Education in Transition: A History of American Colleges and Universities, 1636-1976* (New York, 1976); the various works by Frederick Rudolph; George P. Schmidt, *The Liberal Arts College* (Brunswick, NJ, 1957); and a variety of other work of varying merit. More recently, William C. Ringenberg of Taylor University has written *The Christian College; A History of Protestant Higher Education in America* (Grand Rapids, 1984). The books begins well enough but ultimately defines the Christian college so narrowly (fundamentalist or evangelical) that well over half of the Protestant church colleges in this country would fail to qualify as Christian.

2 Robert Samuel Fletcher, *A History of Oberlin College from its Foundation Through the Civil War* (Oberlin, 1943). John Barnard, *From Evangelicalism to Progressivism at Oberlin College, 1866-1917* (Columbus, 1968). In addition to

Oberlin, Amherst, and Williams, the most cited "small college" is probably Illinois College.

3 Oberlin, of course, no longer maintains any denominational affiliation.

4 All references to income and number of students comes from *American Universities and Colleges* (New York, 1983).

5 Joseph T. Fuhrmann, *Life and Times of Tusculum College* (Greeneville, TN, 1986

6 Probably Liberty University is the best known of these colleges, but Virginia Wesleyan (1966) and Eckerd (1960 as Florida Presbyterian) are just as typical and far less conservative.

7 Tewksbury contends that over three hundred colleges in the South that started before the Civil War had ceased to exist by 1929. Tewksbury, *Founding of American Colleges*, p. 28. This is clearly an exaggerated figure disputed most effectively by Colin Burke, *American Collegiate Populations: A Test of the Traditional View* (New York, 1982), pp. 11-52. Burke lists only 21 colleges that both started and failed before the Civil War. Natalie Naylor, "The Ante-Bellum College Movement: A Reappraisal of Tewksbury's Founding of American Colleges and Universities," *History of Education Quarterly* (Fall, 1973), pp. 261-274. Naylor notes that Tewksbury includes in his study "colleges" that never opened and several that operated only as academies.

8 George R. Fairbanks, *History of the University of the South at Sewanee, Tennessee* (Jacksonville, FL, 1905) is perhaps the oldest of these histories.

9 Fuhrmann, *Life and Times of Tusculum College*, pp. 49-50.

10 Kenneth W. Plummer, *A History of West Virginia Wesleyan College: 1890-1965* (Buckhannon, 1965), p. 31.

11 Ralph Waldo Lloyd, *Maryville College: A History of 150 Years, 1819-1969* (Maryville, TN, 1969), pp. 3-28. Isaac Newton Carr, *History of Carson-Newman College* (Jefferson City, TN, 1959), pp. 63-87. Fuhrmann, *Life and Times of Tusculum College*, pp. 104-108.

12 Jacob Calvin Leonard, *History of Catawba College* (Salisbury, NC, 1927), pp. 247-48.

13 Frank J. Krebs, *Where There is Faith: The Morris Harvey Story, 1888-1970* (Charleston, 1974), pp. 149-50.

14 Daniel Boorstin, *The Americans: The National Experience* (New York, 1965), pp. 124-34.

15 Thomas Richard Ross, *Davis & Elkins: The Diamond Jubilee History* (Elkins, WV, 1980), pp. 15-55.

16 Ralph Waldo Lloyd, *Maryville College: A History of 150 Years, 1819-1969* (Maryville, TN, 1969), p. 36.

17 The social changes that occured in small colleges were rarely publicized and often do not appear in college histories. It was clearly safer not to allow either the local or denominational constituency to know what was going on. On a question like dancing the anticipated furor rarely occured. When Georgetown College in Kentucky lifted the ban on dancing, the Kentucky Baptist Convention expressed great regret, but made no apparent move to censure the college or deny it funds. Robert Snyder, *A History of Georgetown College* (Georgetown, KY, 1979), pp. 143-56. The University of Chattanooga (at one time a Methodist college) allowed dancing at the beginning of the century but changed its policy when ministers threatened to halt church support, then

quietly allowed dancing again. Gilbert Govan and James W. Livengood, *The University of Chattanooga: Sixty Years* (Chattanooga, 1947). PP. 128-9, 235.

[18]Richard Hofstadter, *Academic Freedom in the Age of the College* (New York, 1955), pp. 209-274. Hofstadter was effectively refuted several times in the 1970's, most notably by James Axtell, "The Death of the Liberal Arts College," *History of Education Quarterly* (Winter, 1971), pp. 339-352.

[19] David B. Potts, "American Colleges in the Nineteenth Century: From Localism to Denominationalism," *History of Education Quarterly* (Winter, 1971), pp. 363-80. The article by Potts is based primarily on his study of Baptist colleges and he suggests a shift from the localism of the early 19th century to denominationalism in the latter part of the century was based on a lack of available funds at the local level that required colleges to recruit students and raise money from the churches. He also notes that the Carnegie Foundation, which barred schools with "denominational entanglements" from receiving funds, discovered that 509 out of 615 academic institutions surveyed in 1906 were barred from joining the Carnegie pension fund.

[20] Transylvania is a clear exception to this statement. Transylvania was controlled by different denominations in its early stages, was the subject of a quarrel between those who would keep the school denominational or allow it to be the state university of Kentucky, and finally was racked by dissensions particularly within its College of the Bible.

[21] David Duncan Wallace, *History of Wofford College: 1854-1949* (Nashville, 1951), p. 44. The faculty of Wofford was expected to provide a Christian education but there is more emphasis on the aims of the republic and the evils of "socialistic nostrums" and "foreign pauperism." At a mountain school like Mars Hill, the school talked about "God-fearing men and women" but there are no references to Baptist doctrine. John Angus McLeod, *From These Stones: Mars Hill College. The First Hundred Years* (Mars Hill, NC, 1955), p. 171.

[22] Carr, *History of Carson-Newman College*, pp. 63-87.

[23] Ross, *Davis & Elkins*, pp. 29-54.

[24] Sirus Orestes Bond, *The Light of the Hills: A History of Salem College* (Charleston, WV, 1960), pp. 277-80.

[25] Leonard, *History of Catawba College*, p. 334.

[26] Elisabeth S. Peck and Emily Ann Smith, *Berea's First 125 Years: 1855-1980* (Lexington, 1982), pp. 140-62. Substantial gifts before 1945 almost always came from Northern philanthropists.

[27] Charles Crossfield Ware, *A History of Atlantic Christian College: Culture in Coastal Carolina* (Wilson, NC, 1956), p. 179.

[28] Fuhrmann, *Life and Times of Tusculum College*, pp.75-6.

[29] Ross, *Davis & Elkins*, pp. 136-40, 189.

[30] Isaac Newton Carr, *History of Carson-Newman College* (Jefferson City, TN, 1959), p. 85.

[31] Ross, *Davis & Elkins*, p. 72.

[32] Carr, *History of Carson-Newman*, p. 102. The President of the College on resigning in 1927 wrote to the trustees: "For three years you men have been constantly reminded of my sins and incompetency. . . . in your eagerness for the success of the college you have felt that I should turn loose."

[33] Ross, *Davis & Elkins*, pp. 56-85.

[34] George J. Stevenson, *Increase in Excellence: A History of Emory and Henry College* (New York, 1963), pp. 194-95.

[35] Snyder, *History of Georgetown College*, pp. 143-56.

[36] Merle Curti and Roderick Nash, *Philanthropy in the Shaping of American Education* (New Brunswick, NJ, 1965), pp. 158-59.

[37] Plummer, *A History of West Virginia Wesleyan College*, pp. 98-123.

[38] Fuhrmann, *Life and Times of Tusculum College*, pp. 82-108, 124-25.

[39] *Ibid.* It is not clear what the college had expected but it had received $350,000 over the years. The author knows of one case where a rather optimistic college President expected to receive two or three million from a potential benefactor and instead received nothing at all.

[40] Ross, *Davis & Elkins*, pp. 29-54.

[41] John Angus McLeod, *Mars Hill College*, pp. 207-34. Administrators rarely announce the results of unsuccessful fund drives, but where records are available, the experience of Atlantic Christian College is not unusual. At Atlantic Christian one major church campaign resulted in the school getting $17,000 from a $50,000 goal.

[42] Fuhrmann, *Life and Times of Tusculum*, pp. 155. In one study of giving, it was noted that less than half of the trustees actually contributed to the college.

[43] Erwin S. Bradley, *Union College, 1879-1954* (Barboursville, KY, 1954), pp. 93-108. There is a tendency to include in the assets of the college its physical property. This occasionally makes sense in urban areas where the value of the land may be enormous but for the most part the value of a college campus is only in its status as campus.

[44] Lloyd, *Maryville College*, pp. 235-252.

[45] Fuhrmann, *History of Tusculum College*, p. 275.

[46] There is hardly a college history without a story of faculty going without salary for long periods of time. The depression of the 1930's was only one of many times when this happened. For many colleges the 1920's were worse than the depression, especially in West Virginia. At Maryville College there was only one salary reduction of 10% and that was restored the following year. Lloyd, *Maryville College*, pp. 163-79.

[47] Peck and Smith, *Berea's First 125 Years*, p. 246. The Vice-President for Finance proudly said after noting that there had only been five deficits in thirty-eight years: "We do not spend what we do not take in."